DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 505 PS 017 181

AUTHOR Alexander, Karl L.; And Others
TITLE Getting Ready for First Grade: Standards of Deportment in Home and School. Report No. 8.
INSTITUTION Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, Baltimore, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Grant (W.T.) Foundation, New York, N.Y.; National Inst. of Child Health and Human Development (NIH), Bethesda, Md.; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 87
GRANT NICHD-G-1-RO1-HD-16302; OERI-G-86-0006
NOTE 50p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); *Behavior Standards; Grade 1; Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Role; Primary Education; Reliability; *Social Adjustment; *Socialization; *Student Adjustment; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Role; Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

Research on academic socialization has emphasized the importance of experience in the home and school for shaping the course of academic development. Rarely has research considered whether consistency or congruence of socialization experiences in these two settings is especially beneficial (or, conversely, whether inconsistencies are especially detrimental). This study examines standards of deportment held by parents and classroom teachers, and evaluates in particular whether similarity of behavior standards in the two settings promotes positive school adjustment as indexed by end-of-year test scores and report card marks. These ideas are examined with data from the Beginning School Study, in which a panel of 825 beginning first grade students attending Baltimore City schools in the fall of 1982 were interviewed. Teachers' deportment standards are found to exercise strong influence on year-end performance, but parents' standards are found to be largely ineffectual. The congruence hypothesis receives little support. Fifty-one references are appended. (SKC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Center for Research On Elementary & Middle Schools

PS 017181 ED291505

Report No. 8

February, 1987

GETTING READY FOR FIRST GRADE: STANDARDS OF DEPORTMENT IN HOME AND SCHOOL

Karl L. Alexander, Doris R. Entwisle, Doris Cadigan and Aaron Pallas

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John H. Hownfield
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Johns Hopkins University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CENTER STAFF

EDWARD L. MCDILL, CO-DIRECTOR

JAMES M. MCPARTLAND, CO-DIRECTOR

KARL L. ALEXANDER

HENRY J. BECKER

BARBARA A. BENNETT

JOMILLS H. BRADDOCK II

BARBARA S. COLTON

RUSSELL L. DAWKINS

DORIS R. ENTWISLE

JOYCE L. EPSTEIN

ANNA MARIE FARNISH

DENISE C. GOTTFREDSON

GARY D. GOTTFREDSON

EDWARD J. HARSCH

JOHN H. HOLLIFIELD

LOIS G. HYBL

NANCY L. KARWEIT

MELVIN L. KOHN

NANCY A. MADDEN

ALEJANDRO PORTES

ROBERT E. SLAVIN

CARLETON W. STERLING

ROBERT J. STEVENS

TAMMI J. SWEENEY

L. THOMAS WEBB

Getting Ready for First Grade:
Standards of Deportment in Home and School

Karl L. Alexander
Johns Hopkins University

Doris R. Entwisle
Johns Hopkins University

Doris Cadigan
School of Medicine, University of Maryland

Aaron Pallas
Teacher's College, Columbia University

Report No. 8

February 1987

Published by the Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, supported as a national research and development center by funds from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the OERI, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools
The Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218

Printed and assembled by:
VSP Industries
2440 West Belvedere Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21215

The Center

The mission of the Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools is to produce useful knowledge about how elementary and middle schools can foster growth in students' learning and development, to develop and evaluate practical methods for improving the effectiveness of elementary and middle schools based on existing and new research findings, and to develop and evaluate specific strategies to help schools implement effective research-based school and classroom practices.

The Center conducts its research in three program areas: (1) Elementary Schools, (2) Middle Schools, and (3) School Improvement.

The Elementary School Program

This program works from a strong existing research base to develop, evaluate, and disseminate effective elementary school and classroom practices; synthesizes current knowledge; and analyzes survey and descriptive data to expand the knowledge base in effective elementary education.

The Middle School Program

This program's research links current knowledge about early adolescence as a stage of human development to school organization and classroom policies and practices for effective middle schools. The major task is to establish a research base to identify specific problem areas and promising practices in middle schools that will contribute to effective policy decisions and the development of effective school and classroom practices.

School Improvement Program

This program focuses on improving the organizational performance of schools in adopting and adapting innovations and developing school capacity for change.

This report, prepared by the Elementary School Program, examines how standards of deportment held by teachers and parents affect children's adjustment to school in first grade.

Abstract

Research on academic socialization has emphasized the importance of experience in the home and school for shaping the course of academic development. Rarely, though, has research considered whether consistency or congruence of socialization experiences in these two settings is especially beneficial (or, conversely, whether inconsistencies are especially detrimental). The present study examines standards of deportment held by parents and classroom teachers, and evaluates specifically whether similarity of behavior standards in the two settings promotes positive school adjustment as indexed by end of year test scores and report card marks. These ideas are examined with data from the Beginning School Study, a panel of beginning first graders attending Baltimore City schools in the fall of 1982. Teacher's deportment standards are found to exercise strong influence on year-end performance, but parent's standards are largely ineffectual and the congruence hypothesis receives little support.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by NICHD Grant #1 R01 HD16302, by the W.T. Grant Foundation, and by U.S. Office of Education Grant OERI Grant G-86-0006 to the Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Academic socialization occurs in many contexts and involves many sources of social and interpersonal influence. For young children, the home and school environments generally are accorded central importance, and there is an extensive literature on how experiences in these two settings shape the course of academic development. Much of this research, though, imposes a false dichotomy between home and school, and in doing so ignores important points of contact between them.

This tendency is perhaps best exemplified in the typical research design for studying patterns of school influence. Under this approach school effects are revealed in the "value added" in academic outcomes that can be credited to the school's intervention. Since home and school characteristics tend to be confounded in the real world (i.e., "good" pupils tend to go to "good" schools), disentangling this bundle of assets assumes a high priority. Out-of-school resources become, in effect, an analytic nuisance. They are treated as inputs to the schooling process whose effects must be brought under control for school influences to be properly discerned (see Averch et. al. 1972, for an overview of this "input-output" approach).

But the family, of course, doesn't cease to function with the onset of formal schooling, and it is shortsighted in the extreme to look to home factors as simply establishing a baseline for the assessment of school effects. It is not only the school effects literature, though, which slights the many points of contact between home and school. Rather, even those studies which go to great lengths to encompass socialization influences from both settings often can be faulted on this score. Consider, as an example, the so-called "school process" models used in studies of the status attainment process (e.g., Sewell and Hauser 1980).

Such models attempt a social-psychological accounting of educational inequalities, proceeding from the assumption that socioeconomically linked

differences in attainment outcomes can be traced to differences in socialization practices and influences. This general approach is especially ambitious in its attempt to model processes that cut across institutional boundaries (e.g., the family and school) and levels of analysis (e.g., from social structure to personality). Socialization influences are represented explicitly in the effects of "significant others," most often parents, teachers and peers, on goal orientations (e.g., educational plans, occupational aspirations)[1]. In fact, such models go well beyond simply recognizing teachers and parents as potential sources of academic influence by attempting to take account of the ways in which these socialization agents themselves are influenced by circumstances of the home environment (e.g., family SES) and by characteristics of the youngster (e.g., race, gender, cognitive abilities, and school performance).

In these respects school process studies are much more sensitive to home-school connections than the input-output genre of school effects research. But such models also are very restrictive in how these home and school interdependencies are construed, and as a consequence important, perhaps central, features of the socialization process may be overlooked.

The kinds of conclusions offered up by such inquiry are quite familiar: net of other factors, the effect of parents' influences on goals is such-and-such; and, similarly, all other things equal, an extra unit of teacher encouragement is associated with so much of an increase in students' expectations. Teachers' influences, though, are part of the "net of" when parent effects are estimated, and parents' influences are included in what is "equalized" in estimating teacher effects.

Stated a bit differently, neither source of significant others' influence is conditional on the other[2]. Rather, parent effects are assumed to be similar regardless of the level and/or kind of teacher influence that is experienced, and

teacher influence is assumed to be similar regardless of the level and/or kind of parent influence that is experienced. But does this reflect the way socialization processes are thought to work? Neglected in this approach are the many ways in which home and school experiences might work in tandem to magnify (or dampen, if such influences work at cross-purposes) the impact that either might exercise separately. There are in fact many parallels and linkages between the social organization of schooling and out-of-school institutional structures (including the family), and such interdependencies across institutional contexts generally have been neglected in studies of student development.

Bowles and Gintis' (1976) "correspondence principle" affords one characterization of this interconnectedness. Schools and the family, in their view, service the interests of the broader stratification system by preparing youth for their eventual role in an hierarchically structured economic order. Labor, though, is not homogeneous (e.g., low level work places a premium on good work habits--punctuality, respect for authority, etc.; high level work requires initiative, self-reliance, perhaps creativity, etc.), and experiences in home and school must foster those particular qualities of temperament and habit that will be required in youths' anticipated economic niches. Importantly, in schools this is accomplished mainly through the "hidden curriculum," for it is socialization rather than cognitive training that society most requires of its educational institutions. In the family, these social relations are carried over from parents' work experience: " '... through family relations children tend to acquire orientations toward work, aspirations, and self-concepts preparing them for similar economic positions' (Bowles et al., 1975, p. 17). Once personal development is begun in the family, social relations at school tend to reinforce and further develop it... " (Howell and McBroom 1982, p. 41).

While Bowles and Gintis argue a particular point of view regarding these issues (the evidence on their perspective actually is both fragmentary and mixed;

see, for example, Howell and McBroom 1982; Olneck and Bills 1980), the general notion that there are important parallels in how family and schools foster individual development is widely held. To mention but two of many other possible examples, insights adapted from the so-called New Sociology of Education (e.g., Bourdieu 1977; Karabel and Halsey 1977, Chap. 1) draw attention to the centrality of middle class "cultural capital" in the social organization of schooling (Dimaggio 1982), and aspects of school structure which encourage individual self-direction recently have been found to parallel those previously identified in the home and workplace (Miller et al. 1985).

Over their life-course individuals will move back and forth between many institutional environments, and it seems reasonable to expect that adjustment to a new one will be easier, or more successful, if one is already accustomed to its various operating characteristics. The psychological literature on personal and vocational development houses many variations on the theme of "person-environment" fit (e.g., Holland 1973; Lerner 1985). The reasoning is straightforward: individuals will perform best and be happiest where what is expected of them is consistent with their own inclinations. Authors differ greatly on the dimensions of both environment and individual differences that are deemed most salient to this matching process, but the general notion that a congenial fit makes for optimal adjustment cuts across these otherwise diverse perspectives: "... problems of adjustment to school or to home might thus develop as a consequence of a child's lack of match, or 'goodness of fit' in either or both settings" (Lerner and Busch-Rossnagel 1981, p. 26).

Being out of one's element thus takes its toll, but what determines where one ought to fit in? These psychological perspectives direct attention to the person in situ. Except for research on dialect cleavage, they generally give little consideration to the question of origins at either end--why environments exhibit the

demand characteristics they do, or the sources of relevant individual differences. It is in this latter respect that ideas such as those advanced in Bowles and Gintis' "correspondence principle" may prove relevant, for they propose a model of "environment-environment match" that complements the psychologist's insights regarding person-environment fit (see Epstein 1983, for a more complete treatment of these distinctions). The individual as the object of socialization is the link between the several environments in which he/she participates. In effect, the socialization "outcomes" from one setting, as embodied in individual differences of linguistic competence, temperament, personality, interests, aptitudes, etc., constitute the "inputs" to the others, providing the basis for a model of environmental congruence. Hence, if schools reward respect for authority, then those youngsters who already have acquired such an attitude in the home will find the transition from home to school less difficult, and would be expected to perform better in school as a result. In general, home-school congruence should facilitate adjustment to school by helping youngsters acclimate to the requirements of the student role--i.e, by enhancing person-environment fit[3].

Despite the extensive literature on parents and teachers as significant others in the lives of children (see Alexander and Eckland 1980; Sewell and Hauser 1980; and Shea 1976 for relevant reviews), the consistency of home and school socialization experiences generally has been neglected as a research agenda. About the only such issue on which there is a substantial literature involves patterns of language usage in the home (see Bernstein 1964; Williams 1970). Other parallels between the social relations of home and school have received scant attention (see Hess and Holloway 1984, pp. 183-196, for an overview). In fact, to our knowledge, the only exception is Epstein and McPartland's research (1977; Epstein 1983, 1984) on the congruence of home and school decision-making styles and authority relations (e.g., "open" vs "traditional")[4]. Results from these inquiries have been

mixed: home-school consistency has little bearing on students' cognitive performance, but does appear to encourage positive attitudes toward school. The research of Lambert, McNamara and others, in which Anglophone children received all school instruction in French, suggests, however, that the specifics of the "fit" -- i.e. particular language usages, modes of instruction, and the like -- are relatively trivial if the general social context of home and school are compatible. In other words, teachers' optimistic attitudes about children's educability, parent's enthusiastic support of the school, children's perception of teachers' and parents' positive attitudes may override language differences as striking as an English/French split.

Despite the dearth of inquiry into such matters, their potential importance is widely appreciated: "... many children fail not because of inability but because they are ill-prepared for the mode of social interaction encountered in many classrooms" (Fischer and Bullock 1984, p. 117). Minority and disadvantaged youth in particular often are thought to experience such difficulties owing to their "outsider" status vis-a-vis the middle class culture that governs the social relations of schooling. Such apprehensions presume a lack of syncronization or consonance between the home and school environments of such youngsters, but the specific cultural and or situational details thought to be at the root of this "mismatch", except for linguistic ones, rarely are identified, and rarer still are attempts to evaluate their effects empirically.

There are many candidates for such an inquiry. The one considered in the present investigation is congruence between home and school standards of deportment. It has long been appreciated that "acceptable" conduct is integral to the academic reward system (Parsons 1959), and an accumulating literature suggests the relevance of school deportment to various academic outcomes (Coleman et al. 1982; Entwisle and Hayduk 1982; Williams 1976), including, it appears, attainment

differences between minority and majority youngsters (Kerckhoff and Campbell 1977). Adjustment to schooling thus could be complicated when standards of behavior acquired in the home depart from those expected at school, and this is one tangible way in which family socialization practices can either facilitate or impede the transition from home to school.

Using data procured from the parents and teachers of a large, diverse sample of beginning first graders in Baltimore City public schools, we look to see whether agreement on standards of good and poor conduct contributes to early school success. Report card marks and standardized test performance are considered as outcomes. As part of the fieldwork for the first year of the Beginning School Study (BSS), the parents and homeroom teachers of sample students were asked to provide examples of what they considered "good" and "poor" conduct. Multiple regression is used to evaluate the importance for pupil achievement of parent-teacher agreement on deportment standards.

In terms of procedures, a measure of concordance is entered into the analysis after first adjusting for several student "inputs" known to be important determinants of school performance (race, sex, family SES, and standardized test performance from the fall of the first grade), and for parents' and teachers' individual responses[5]. This approach should reveal whether consistency in behavior standards across these two settings contributes to academic success in the first grade over and above what would be expected from the personal resources already in place at the time of school entry, and from the behavioral expectations held separately by parents and teachers. In addition to reporting results for the full sample, all analyses are performed separately for blacks and whites and for three SES groupings (defined by parent's education). This will allow us to consider whether agreement on behavior standards is especially important for the

performance of minority and disadvantaged youngsters, as the prior literature generally assumes.

The early years of formal schooling probably are optimal for exploring such issues, and grade one is especially opportune. Children are most malleable when they are young and first acclimating to the school routine, and it is critically important that they get off to a good start. Habits established during these formative years, and attitudes acquired regarding both school and self, have long-lasting repercussions, for academic achievement trajectories emerge early and persist thereafter with a high degree of stability (Alexander and Cook 1982). In the next section, the Beginning School Study and the data used in the present analysis are described more fully.

METHODS

Our data come from the Beginning School Study (BSS), a panel study of beginning first graders from twenty Baltimore City public elementary schools. To assure coverage of the full range of settings within the city system, schools were selected randomly from within strata defined by socioeconomic level and racial composition. Kindergarten rosters from the 1981/1982 school year, supplemented by rosters of new registrants in the fall, were used to draw a random sample of 825 fall 1983 beginning first graders from these twenty schools. Sampling was done within classrooms, so all first grade classes in these schools are represented in the final sample. Although these youngsters were interviewed individually at the beginning and the end of the year, these data are not used in the present analysis. Rather, school records (i.e., test scores and marks), parents and teachers provide the necessary information. About 800 parents (usually mothers) were interviewed during the summer and fall of the first year (all interviews were completed before

the first marking period) and questionnaire information was procured from teachers on three occasions throughout the school year. Fifty of fifty-five first grade teachers responded to at least one of these questionnaires.

The variables used in this analysis are organized into three groups: input controls, deportment standards, and outcomes[6]. Each is discussed in turn.

Input Controls:

1. Race: coded "0" for white, "1" for black. The few orientals and Hispanics included in the sample were classified as "white".

2. Sex: coded "0" for boys, "1" for girls.

3. Parent's educational level*: coded as number of school years compieted. These data apply to the interviewed parent, usually the student's mother.

4. Fall California Achievement Test scores (CAT)*: coded as the average of subtest scale scores in verbal and math domains separately. The CAT battery (Level 11, Form C) was administered by school personnel in October of 1982 and May of 1983 in all twenty schools. Fall scores are used as input controls. The verbal CAT score is the average of four subtests (phonology, vocabulary, comprehension and language). The math CAT score is the average of two subtests (computation and concepts). In the few instances where some subtest scores were missing, averages were computed on the subtests available.

Conduct Standards:

Parent and teacher respondents were asked to give examples of what they considered to be "good" and "poor" conduct, with space provided on the survey instrument to record several instances of each. These open-ended responses subsequently were coded into a classification derived inductively from careful review of response patterns. The intention was to preserve meaningful distinctions while at the same time reducing response complexity. Seven measures were derived, combining "good" and "poor" responses. Respondents received a score for each, this being the number of instances mentioned in a particular category (with values ranging from zero to "N", the maximum number mentioned). The following distinctions are employed (with "good" examples in parentheses)[7]:

1. Follows rules (minds teacher; is good, raises hand; pays attention);
2. Respects others (shows concern for others; works well with peers);
3. Respects self (understands own ability; shows self-respect; acts age; mature);
4. Good citizen (maintains attractive classroom; good attendance; takes pride in work);
5. Shows initiative (works independently; takes responsibility; takes leadership role);
6. Conforms to academic routine (finishes tasks; does homework; has good work habits);
7. Proper values (polite; respects adults and property; helpful).

In calculating congruence, the "good" and "poor" distinctions are retained. Using the categories for which either parent or teacher had a non-zero code as the

base, agreement was computed as the percent for which parent and teacher both had non-zero values.

Outcomes:

1. Spring CAT scores*: spring performance on the verbal and quantitative subtests of the CAT battery are used to assess year-end cognitive performance. Details on the test and its administration are provided in the description of input controls, where the counterpart fall test is used.

2. First and Fourth quarter school marks*:

a. Reading and mathematics marks were transcribed from report cards. Each is scored on a four-point scale, ranging from "4" to "1". This corresponds to the marking system used on report cards ("excellent", "good", "satisfactory", and "unsatisfactory").

b. Conduct marks also were taken from report cards. Conduct is evaluated on a two-point scale: "2", satisfactory, versus "1", needs improvement.

RESULTS

Means and standard deviations for the control variables and outcomes are reported in Table 1. These details are unexceptional and require no comment. On the other hand, the corresponding information for conduct standards, presented in Table 2, does warrant brief consideration.

--Tables 1 & 2 about here--

The responses of teachers and parents are widely scattered across our classification. Among parents, all but one category averaged well below one instance per respondent. The exception is "Follows Rules," with an overall average of 2.5. Black parents and those with fewer years of schooling mentioned

rule-oriented behavior less frequently than whites and those with higher levels of schooling, respectively, but these differences are quite small relative to the overall variability in response patterns (see the standard deviations, reported in parentheses). Although the other categories are mentioned infrequently by our parent sample, relative differences in some instances are quite large, especially between those with less than a high school education and those with at least some college. Among the former, following rules is almost the exclusive preoccupation. In fact, the only other category that even approaches .5 among these parents also emphasizes compliance: doing assignments. Following rules is salient among more highly educated parents too, but in four of the other six categories their averages more than double those of their less schooled counterparts. The impression, then, is one of lower class preoccupation with conformity to external rules, which accords with numerous studies describing class differences in "focal concerns" and socialization practices (e.g., Bronfenbrenner 1958; Brofenbrenner and Crouter 1982; Kohn 1977)[8]. For example, in Hess and Shipman's (1965) laboratory study in which black parents were attempting to prepare their 4-year-olds for school, the mothers of the lowest SES children emphasized the need for children to follow rules and obey the teacher while higher SES mothers emphasized the opportunities for individual action the classroom might offer.

In the lower portion of Table 2 we see the corresponding data for teachers. The comparisons by race and SES level have a different meaning here, as the "splits" organize the data not according to the teachers' own characteristics but, rather, according to the kinds of pupils they teach. The entries, then, indicate the sorts of concerns that weigh most on the teachers of blacks as opposed to whites, or of low SES students as opposed to high.

Teachers, like parents, are especially interested in following rules. For them, however, other concerns also are prominent: three of the other six

categories have averages above one, and one of these, "Respects Others", averages above two. Evidencing proper values (e.g., being polite, respectful and helpful) and finishing assignments are the other two categories with high averages. The teacher averages exceed the parent figures in every instance.

Among teachers the importance accorded "following rules" does not differ greatly as a function of the kinds of students being taught, but other concerns do seem to be conditioned by the student context. Most of these contrasts revolve around SES rather than race, although the teachers of whites appear to be more interested in "respect for self" (e.g., understands own ability; acts age) than the teachers of blacks. This holds as well for the teachers of high SES, as opposed to low SES, youngsters. The former also are more concerned with respect for others and signs of good citizenship-- maintains an attractive classroom, takes pride in one's work, and so forth. Other differences, including instances where factors are mentioned more often by the teachers of lower SES pupils (i.e., shows initiative and does assignments), are quite small.

The degree of parent-teacher agreement in categories of response is indicated in the last row, labeled "% Congruence." The overall figure is just over thirty percent, with black parents evidencing somewhat lower levels of agreement with teachers than white parents. Surprisingly, we find no differences by SES level.

-- Table 3 about here--

The consequences for students' academic performance of these differences in parents' and teachers' standards of deportment are evaluated in Table 3, which reports the results of our regression analyses. Of particular interest is the matching proposition: that youngsters whose parents and teachers agree on such matters should find the school routine less foreign, feel more comfortable with the expectations held for them, and do better as a consequence.

The rows of Table 3 present the levels of explained variance associated with the successive stages of a stepwise regression analysis. By comparing entries within a column, the increment in explanatory power associated with the various predictor sets can be determined: input controls first, parent standards next; teacher standards third; and, lastly, the measure of parent-teacher agreement. Adjusted and unadjusted estimates of explained variance are reported, the latter being the figure in parentheses for each paired entry. The correction adjusts for the positive bias that is characteristic of explained variance estimates, which becomes increasingly severe as the ratio of regressors to degrees of freedom increases. Our analyses add seven variables each in the parent and teacher sets, and the subgroup sample sizes are not as large as would be desirable[9]. Under such circumstances, use of the adjusted figures is prudent, and we do find that the original and corrected figures often differ appreciably.

The levels of explained variance associated with our several control variables, which include fall test scores in the outcome domain (i.e, verbal for reading marks and CAT-V; quantitative for math marks and CAT-Q) range from just under thirty percent to almost forty-five percent for the academic criteria. For conduct marks, the equations are far less powerful, generally hovering about ten percent explained variance. Subgroup differences generally are not large, with the exception of the considerably higher figures obtained for the high SES group. Educational level is included as a control variable in these equations, and these differences reflect the fact that there is more educational variance for this group than the others (see the standard deviations from Table 1)[10].

As regards the issues of immediate interest, we find considerable consistency in the overall patterning of results across outcomes. Adding parent responses to the set of controls in no instance produces a substantial increase in explained variance. In fact, in most instances the adjusted figure from the second

row is lower than that from the first, indicating that the gain in explanatory power is less than would be expected by chance given the number of predictors added to the equation!

Teachers' standards, on the other hand, do appear to matter. The adjusted increments to explained variance associated with the addition of teachers' deportment responses (equation III) to the set of controls and parent responses (equation II) is positive in seven of the eight instances, and three of these exceed two percent[11]. It is of some significance, we think that the largest differences are concentrated in first quarter report card marks: 1.5 percent for reading; 4.0 percent for math; and 2.7 percent for conduct. In comparison, the gains for year-end test scores are quite trivial: zero for the verbal domain; .6 percent for the quantitative. This pattern suggests that these teacher values do not so much affect actual student learning as they do techniques of classroom management and how teachers evaluate performance. We will return to this possibility in our concluding discussion. First, though, we must complete our review of the results themselves, especially those pertaining to the congruence hypothesis.

These are presented in the fourth row of results from Table 3, which reports levels of explained variance for our most inclusive equations, those that add the measure of parent-teacher agreement to the input controls, parents' deportment standards and teachers' deportment standards. The comparisons of interest again weigh explained variance from these equations against that from their immediate predecessors. Here too the implications seem clear-cut: as with the parent predictors, there is not a single instance in which the congruence measure improves significantly upon the model's explanatory power. There thus appears to be little support in these data for the idea that home and school agreement on standards of good and poor conduct promotes academic success.

The picture is very much the same when blacks and whites and youngsters from the three educational groupings are considered separately, at least with regard to the unimportance of parents' conduct standards and of parent-teacher congruence. There are practically no instances in which these seem at all important, and the few exceptions (e.g., black parents for fall conduct marks) present no obvious pattern. On the other hand, in the case of teacher effects this additional detail suggests for whom and in what areas these attitudes matter most.

Where differences in explanatory power are noteworthy (which isn't always the case), they almost always favor whites over blacks and high SES youngsters over their low SES counterparts. For fall conduct marks, for example, the increment in explained variance associated with the addition of teacher deportment responses is .09 among whites and .028 among blacks; for spring math marks the respective figures are .082 and .022; and for spring verbal test scores they are .039 vs. .009-- a smaller difference in absolute terms, but one of the larger involving test scores. Some of the differences across SES levels are even larger, comparing high against low: .11 for fall math and conduct marks and .045 for spring quantitative scores.

There are exceptions to this pattern, and other differences that conform to it are smaller than those mentioned, but the general trend seems rather clear: it is among the more advantaged youngsters rather than the less advantaged that the distinctions drawn in these responses come most often and most forcefully into play. This is the opposite of what had been posited under the congruence hypothesis, but it is variations in teachers' attitudes that are at issue here, and not parent-teacher agreement. We had no prior expectations as to the absolute importance of teachers' behavior standards, so our attempt to comprehend the significance of this pattern will necessarily be conjectural and post-hoc. To aid in this task we thought it would be helpful to identify the specific teacher response

configurations that contributed most to these results. To search these out, the parent deportment measures and the parent-teacher congruence measure were deleted from the anaylsis and the regressions recomputed, this time adding the codes from the teacher set serially via a forward selection stepwise procedure. The input controls are used thoughout.

The significant predictors from these analyses are presented in Table 4, in their order of entry. Hence, the first listed category made the largest independent contribution to explained variance, the second the next largest contribution, and so forth. The signs in parentheses are the direction of that variable's coefficient[12]. A negative sign thus indicates that lower values on some deportment measure are associated with higher performance. In the extreme case, students whose teachers failed to mention such a trait altogether would perform better than those whose teachers considered that quality more important. Most of the signs in Table 4 are positive, though, indicating that high valuation of these qualities is associated with better marks or test scores.

-- Table 4 about here --

The patterning of these results is quite varied across both outcomes and comparison groups, precluding staightforward interpretation. This is not too surprising, as the task itself is difficult: trying to disentangle empirically the effects within a set of moderately correlated predictors using small to moderately-sized samples. Still, the results can be considered at least suggestive, and the suggestions seem quite interesting.

Consider the first column of results, that for the total sample. The significant effects are concentrated in the fall, where report card marks are the criteria. There is a particular dearth of predictors for standardized test performance in the spring, which accords with the pattern indicated in the increments to explained variance discussed above. Interestingly, the rule-oriented

values, which were the ones most often ascribed to, are not at all prominent as sources of achievement variance. Of the twelve predictors listed through spring reading marks, only two are of this character: "Follows Rules" as the second entry for fall conduct marks and "Does Assignments" as the third entry for spring reading marks. Much more important, it seems, are assorted "middle class" virtues: showing initiative; being a good citizen, and understanding one's own strengths and weaknesses.

Results for the separate groups are a bit more difficult to organize, as we see sign reversals and little consistency across outcomes. Still, several details command attention. For those outcomes where teacher attitudes appear to have their greatest impact (i.e., first quarter marks), non-conformist considerations still stand out among whites-- proper values and self-respect. Rule-following, though, does appear as a secondary factor in these instances, and ranks first in two of the fourth quarter marking areas. The negative effects associated with "initiative" and "citizenship" in the case of verbal and quantitative test performance seem to us anomalous, as do the negative effects observed for test scores in the subgroup analyses. Differences involving CAT scores were small over all, and these may simply be random fluctuations. The fact that there are few significant teacher effects altogether for test scores among the subsamples is consistent with this interpretation.

The pattern of results among blacks differs markedly from those for whites, and especially where teacher effects are largest-- the case of first quarter marks. In each instance the first ranking effect among blacks is negatively signed: values for reading and conduct; rules for math. It may just be coincidence or happenstance that the first quarter response patterns for the teachers of blacks are dominated by negative coefficients, but there is another, perhaps more telling, possibility. Teachers who place a premium on "proper values" and on "following

rules" may be especially frustrated when their expectations for how pupils ought to behave are not fulfilled in the context of predominately black inner-city schools, and they may find themselves, whether consciously or not, grading these students down as a result. The other negative signs observed for fourth quarter marks and test scores among blacks could also reflect such dynamics, although as just mentioned we are uncertain how much confidence should be placed in the results for test performance.

This general interpretation accords well with results from an analysis of teacher effects conducted with these data and reported elsewhere (Alexander et al., 1985). Although the issues in that inquiry were entirely different from those pursued here, some of the conclusions seem germane. In particular, we found that minority youngsters performed less well with high SES teachers (as indexed by the status characteristics of their family of origin; specifically, their father's occupational status) than with low SES teachers. The high SES teachers of minority youngsters, in turn, had especially low scores on a scale intended to measure perceived school climate. The picture, then, was one of disaffected teachers producing low achieving students, and the hint of frustrated normative expectations in the present instance may be another reflection of that disaffection.

If this scenerio has merit, it probably is significant that it is linked to the pupils' racial membership rather than socioeconomic level: all the first-ranking predictors for the low SES student sample are positive. In scanning these results within SES levels, there again is little indication that teachers' emphasis on rule-following has much bearing on student achievement. Rather, it is the more inner-directed traits-- self-respect; initiative, and good citizenship-- that dominate the regression results.

These results, then, are at least suggestive at to some of the specific teacher standards that might be conducive to high levels of school achievement.

We will return to these conclusions, and to what we think they imply, in the discussion that follows, but perhaps more important than these details is the general impression that teachers, and the attitudes and values they hold, play an important role in structuring the classroom environment. An accumulating literature points to the importance of classroom dynamics in school achievement processes, and to the teacher as the critical agent of the school in structuring those dynamics (Bossert 1977; Murnane 1975; Summers and Wolfe 1977). The findings reported here reinforce our conviction that teachers can indeed make a difference, and suggest that first grade teachers particularly may set the stage for future schooling. Further inquiry into the specific teacher characteristics that are influential, and into the specific student-teacher relationships through which such influence is exercised, should be productive.

SOME SPECULATIONS

In these concluding remarks we forego the customary "summary and discussion" in favor of a broader, and more speculative, framing of these issues in the context of recent writings on classroom and family process. Much of what follows goes well beyond the evidence presented, but it is consistent with that evidence and hopefully will suggest fruitful lines for further inquiry.

The implications of these analyses raise two main questions: why were parents' deportment standards, and parent-teacher agreement, not more influential in promoting student achievement; and, what is the significance of the much more substantial effects obtained for teachers' behavior standards? The latter observation was serendipitous, in that the issue of teacher effectiveness was not our main concern and the results simply presented themselves in working our way toward a test of the congruence hypothesis. Nevertheless, that teachers' ideas regarding proper student behavior might color how they evaluate student

performance, and through such evaluations perhaps even have an impact on actual achievement, finds support in the literature on teacher expectancy effects (i.e., the self-fulfilling prophecy notion-- see, for example, Rist 1970, 1973; Rosenthal and Jacobson 1968). And, as noted above, several other recent lines of inquiry also have converged upon the teacher's pivotal role in structuring classroom dynamics (see the references cited above).

Insofar as our findings bear upon the matter of self-fulfilling prophecies, however, there is a critical missing link: the student's self-image or self-expectations. The chain of events posited in this model of classroom process is by now familiar: teachers' impressions of students' academic promise are formed early in the school year and are grounded, at least in part, in false or educationally irrelevant indications (e.g., tattered dress or use of street language); these beliefs become the accepted definition of the situation, as teachers, and eventually others, behave as though they were true; then the circle closes, as these beliefs are absorbed into youths' emergent definitions of self. Restated a bit more concretely for the negative case: teachers identify some children as losers from the very start; these children are given less attention and their abilities denigrated in various subtle and not so subtle ways; other children in the class follow the teacher's lead and ostracize their classmates (e.g., teasing or shunning the dummies); eventually the youngsters so treated come to think of themselves in like fashion, as failures. They then give up and/or act out, and in so doing both confirm the teacher's initial judgment and engineer their own failure.

This is an appealing scenerio, as it is grounded in venerated ideas from the symbolic interactionist perspective (e.g., writings by Cooley, Mead, Thomas and others) and accords with intuitions about how impressionable youngsters would respond to such pressures. Unfortunately, the supportive evidence is not nearly so compelling as the ideas are plausible (e.g., Dusek 1975; Elashoff and Snow 1971;

Williams 1976), and in the present instance we find rather marked teacher effects in the absence of the presumed intermediary mechanisms (i.e., pupils' altered definitions of self and the consequent deflection of achievement trajectories). We must hasten to add, though, that these possibilities were not pursued in our analyses, and it is possible that teachers' standards of behavior actually do exercise their influence via the expectancy route.

We grant this as a possibility, but in terms of probabilities think it extremely remote. First, the effects of teachers' deportment standards on year-end test performance range from small to inconsequential, and more often the latter than the former. If learning is enhanced through these teacher-induced processes, it is not the sort of learning that is reflected in improved performance on an achievement battery. Second, and more fundamentally, this interpretation places a great deal of weight on the frail shoulders of an emergent sense of self.

In other work with these data (Entwisle et al. 1986a, 1986b) we have examined in some detail the performance expectations and self-images of these youngsters. What is most striking in these inquiries is the amorphous character of these notions about the self and their failure to affect other learning outcomes. The academic self-image of these youngsters appears to emerge gradually over first grade, and for most children (all except high-gainers and black girls) has no effect on CAT score gains. While this could be peculiar to the children in our sample, we very much doubt it, and suspect instead that it is rather typical of children in this age range.

Performance expectations were fancifully optimistic at year's start, and remain so throughout the year, oblivious in the main to feedback from such seemingly relevant sources as parents' expectations for their children's school performance and the evaluations contained in three report cards! Moreover, these

expectations were themselves largely ineffectual as precursors of later performance, as indexed by both marks and test scores[13].

The impression from these analyses bears little resemblance to the imagery implicit in the expectancy model, which portrays first-graders as highly efficient information-processing, self-reflexive, goal-oriented actors soaking up cues from their social surroundings in order to achieve a coherent, integrated sense of self as an academic. This may seem more a caricature than a characterization, but we think not, for this literature makes strong claims regarding the profound and lasting repercussions attending such social-psychological processes in the earliest grade levels.

It is not our intention to denigrate these ideas; quite the contrary, we need a sensitive accounting of the way self understandings are acquired. But developmental processes are involved that respond to many dimensions of the social context, and these play themselves out over the long haul. We are reminded here of Wrong's (1961) admonition against deus ex machina invocation of socialization explanations. Applied to the circumstances of the very young, the actor-driven expectancy model asks more of the emergent sense of self than it is capable of delivering.

There are, of course, many routes to teacher influence other than through pupils' self-images. Despite the many difficulties involved in classroom management, teachers actually occupy a very powerful position vis-a-vis their students. They are the embodiment of organizational authority, and with young children they represent adult authority as well. In the social relations of the classroom, it is the teacher who doles out rewards and punishments, bears responsibility for performance evaluations, and maintains control over resources. At least with regard to things academic, this is an impressive arsenal.

Teachers, of course, differ greatly in their management styles, and this no doubt has implications for their effectiveness in exploiting the formal power that they command (many teachers do lose control of their classes!) and for the ends they pursue in their exercise of that authority. On the matter of effectiveness, Brophy and Good (1974, p. 115) distinguish three teacher types: the proactive, who make things happen; the reactive, who respond to circumstances as they present themselves; and the overreactive, an exaggerated reactive type whose rigidity and susceptibility to misreading cues can set into motion the "prophetic" chain of events. It seems reasonable that teachers who value such things as initiative and self-understanding in their pupils will tend to be more proactive in their classroom management as they try to draw out and nurture such qualities.

But being proactive does not necessarily mean controlling, and different management styles may actually be keyed toward very different conceptions of the student role. Kedar-Voivodas (1983) has identified three student role-types: the pupil; the receptive learner; and the active learner. The first reflects the agenda of Bowles and Gintis' "hidden curriculum": passivity, docility; conformity, respect for authority, impulse control, etc. The receptive learner is the "acceptable student," doing what is asked of her, but little more. She finishes her homework, stays on task, etc. The active learner is the "go-getter." Not content with simply "doing her work", she is inquisitive and independent, wants to know why, and frequently will challenge authority. She is, in effect, the student counterpart of the proactive teacher.

Most teachers, when queried, express a preference for pupils and receptive learners (see Hess and Holloway 1984, pp. 181-183). This is consistent with the high valuation placed on rule-following among our teachers. But not all teachers stop with an orderly classroom, and those who also value initiative and self-insight

on the part of their pupils will tend toward a proactive teaching style as they try to encourage proactive qualities in their students.

We found, overall, that when teachers espoused such values, marks were higher. This doesn't necessarily mean that more cognitive learning occurred, though, as test scores were impervious to such influences. We suspect, rather, that group process is conditioned by these differences in teachers' priorities. Where their initiatives find a receptive audience, both teachers and students react positively. Teachers find the classroom dynamics gratifying under such circumstances, and possibly wind up rewarding students for strides made in areas that are, strictly speaking, non-cognitive, but important nonetheless to their conception of the student role. The high valuation of inner-directed qualities in teachers' marking practices accords with DiMaggio's insights (1982) regarding the intrusion of middle class "cultural capital" in the academic reward system.

But things don't always turn out that well, or even that way. We found, for example, only small marking differences associated with teachers' ideas about good and poor conduct among low SES youngsters and blacks. And among the latter, teacher's high regard for such things as initiative and self-regard actually was associated with lower, not higher, marks. Why should this be?

We observed that parents in general were narrowly preoccupied with rule conforming behavior. They were concerned that their children be good pupils-- not receptive learners, not active learners, at least not as a first concern. While this attitude was typical of all parents, responses were especially skewed in this direction among black and low SES parents, for they rarely mentioned any other considerations. If rule-following and respect for authority are the preeminent concerns in such family contexts, as both prior research (Bronfenbrenner 1958; Hess and Shipman 1965; Kohn 1977) and the present evidence suggest, then youngsters

who have experienced nothing else may find it exceeding difficult to respond to a teacher who wants them to be more self-directed and self-reliant.

Our congruence hypothesis found no support in these data, but perhaps there simply were too few parents, either black or white or from any SES level, who valued self-respect and initiative sufficiently as school priorities to trigger the sort of snow-balling effect anticipated in that hypothesis. However, the "leanings" in this direction observed for white and high SES parents might at least have prepared their children to respond "appropriately" when presented with a teacher determined to see them "grow" in these ways.

The notion that a high threshold of congruence may be required before "home-school match" makes a noticeable difference seems to us a plausible refinement of the congruence hypothesis. Additionally, we suggest the possibility of a zone of receptivity below that threshold that distinguishes the familiar from the foreign. Youngsters from advantaged households may be sufficiently familiar with the values espoused by proactive teachers, and with style of classroom management used by them, that they at least are able to work successfully in such a context.

On the other hand, children who are prepared only to accept the pupil role (e.g. they will try to be well-behaved and respectful), or at best the receptive learner role (e.g., they will follow orders-- fill in their workbooks; do their homework), may simply be incapable of accomodating to a teacher who expects more of them. Perhaps teacher and pupils can find a middle ground where this mismatch betweeen teachers' priorities and pupils' learning styles doesn't prove too disruptive (i.e., the case of low SES youngsters), but one easily can imagine a deterioration of classroom process under such circumstances, with teachers winding up both frustrated and disappointed (i.e., the case of blacks).

Youngsters, in this sense, are not simply passive recipients of the teachers' preferred style. Rather, differences in their willingness and/or ability to satisfy the teachers' expectations as to the kind of class she wants will determine what actually ensues. This is a good example, we think, of the ways in which children become "producers of their own development" (e.g., Lerner and Busch-Rossnagel 1981).

These ruminations suggest a modification of the congruence hypothesis and various ways in which differences in classroom process could crystallize around differences in teachers' deportment standards. In developing these arguments, we had occasion to draw upon to some details of the parents' data (e.g., the preoccupation of minority and low SES parents with rule-oriented behavior), but perhaps a bit more ought to be said about the inefficacy of parents' behavior standards.

It is important to keep in mind that we have no idea from these data how students actually were behaving. The issue is not whether students who violate school rules, who are disruptive, etc. perform poorly. We assume this is the case. It is, rather, whether parents' and teachers' ideas about good and poor behavior, and their likemindedness on such matters, affects school achievement. Our speculations suggest some ways in which teachers' ideas along these lines might influence their classroom style. Corresponding ideas in the home are thought relevant because they condition pupils' receptivity to these teacher initiatives, not necessarily because they enter the class already acting in accord with the teachers' expectations.

There can be little doubt that parent attitudes and behaviors which encourage compliance with school rules will pay off scholastically-- the "hidden curriculum" actually is quite overt in many respects, and facets of it essential to an orderly learning environment. But as a model of normative and/or behavioral

socialization, our questions regarding behavior standards barely begin to scratch the surface. Patterson's (1982) studies and clinical observations with aggressive children, for example, indicate that setting rules is only one element in the effective regulation of behavior. These rules must be monitored, transgressions properly defined, and appropriate sanctions applied consistently. Family processes can be deficient in any or all these respects, and this in all likelihood applies as well to effective socialization in "normal" circumstances.

But even if it could be assumed that our parents were effective in regulating the behaviors they deem important and in assuring the transfer of those behaviors to the school environment (see Patterson on the situational specificity of behavior patterns: 1982, pp. 28-29), their relevance to achievement still would remain problematic. The difficulty is that the facets of the student role emphasized by parents apparently are not those emphasized by teachers in their pupil evaluations, and if nothing else our results point to an important element of subjectivity in these evaluation processes. It is not that such considerations are unimportant-- the high rankings accorded rule-following behavior by both parents and teachers belies any such conclusion. But they apparently are not the traits that impress teachers when doling out grades.

Our analyses, it should be recalled, control for fall test scores, so that the effects on performance of objectively assessed competency are absorbed into the input controls. This, it seems, also takes account of whatever academic credit accrues to the "pupil" and the "receptive student" facets of the student role, for rule-following values had little bearing on marks in our results. Rather, the things that made an impression beyond "working up to one's ability" were the qualities associated with the "active" student role, and these qualities, we now realize, are given scant attention by parents.

The above discussion is intended to suggest both the complexity and the promise of studying classroom process and home-school linkages. There was little support in our results for the notions which motivated this inquiry, but the "sideline" insights obtained were illuminating nonetheless: that teachers' ideas about student deportment do influence their evaluations; that it is more "inner-directed" rather than conforming behaviors that are most salient in their marking practices; and that parents' ideas carry little weight because they ignore those qualities that most influence teachers' evaluations. Finally, the rather glaring disjuncture between the issues considered in our test of the congruence hypothesis and those we were moved to reflect upon as a result of the failure of that test carries a clear message: the issues themselves remain very much open.

Footnotes

1. Some studies have gone beyond this a priori classification to consider a broader range of "significant others," usually identified by querying the respondents themselves-- see, for example, Scritchfield and Picou (1982).

2. Although this focus on "main effects" is not intrinsic to the issues, as a practical matter the literature presents few interaction analyses-- see for an exception Gasson et al. (1972). While certain types of interactions have been studied extensively (e.g., differences by race, gender, community size), interactions involving significant others' influences have not received much scrutiny.

3. This is not intended to suggest, however, that there is such a thing as "the" student role. See Kedar-Voivadas (1983) and our concluding comments on the dimensionality of student role performance.

4. Howell and McBroom (1982) also have examined similarities in modes of control used at home and at school, but their study does not consider effects on student outcomes.

5. In preliminary analyses we experimented with many other input controls, including measures of parents' and students' performance expectations, and a fourteen item scale measuring pupils' temperament or personal maturity. In general, the patterning of results was quite similar as those reported here, although, of course, levels of explained variance were considerably higher with the more extensive list of controls. However, in order to avoid any possibility of inadvertently "controlling out" some portion of either parent or teacher influence, we employ the more limited set of controls in the results presented here.

6. To minimize attrition owing to scattered missing data patterns, missing values were imputed for certain "core" variables. These are identified with asterisks in the variable descriptions. Subgroup averages were assigned separately for those held back and those promoted at the end of first grade in order to derive more accurate missing data estimates.

7. In general, "poor" responses were the reflections of "good", with the exception of follows rules. For that category there were several negative extremes (e.g., "cries", "hyper", "clowns") which had no "good conduct" counterparts. In preliminary analyses the "good" and "poor" conduct codes were entered separately, but the results were largely uninterpretable owing to collinearity problems-- e.g., offsetting signs, etc. Hence the decision to combine "good" and "poor" responses in the present analysis.

8. A caveat is in order here: it is possible that these response patterns are an artifact of class differences in verbal fluency rather than a reflection of SES differences in value orientation. With the data available to us, it is impossible to distinguish these two interpretations.

9. Pairwise present correlations are used throughout these analyses. For the full sample, the case base for these ranges from 607 to 825; for whites and blacks the respective figures are 374-290 and 451-317; and, for the subsamples based on parent's education, the figures are: 227-307 for less than high school, 241-283 for high school graduates, and 137-196 for greater than high school.

10. For the subsample of high school graduates education is a constant, and consequently is not included in the set of input controls.

11. We adopt an increment to explained variance of one percent as our threshold for imputing substantive significance to the pattern of influence. With the overall levels of explained variance obtained here (generally .3-.4), the sample sizes used (see footnote 9) and the number of degrees of freedom involved (i.e., seven in the set of deportment codes for both teachers and parents), even in the subgroup analyses increments to explained variance well below one percent would reach significance at conventional alpha levels.

12. The signs reported are from the first stage in which a variable was entered, not the final step.

13. In preliminary analyses we also considered students' performance expectations as dependent variables vis-a-vis the parent and teacher deportment measures used here. The levels of explained variance obtained in these analyses were quite small (never exceeding five percent in even our most inclusive equations), and there were few instances of noteworthy increases attending the inclusion of parent or teacher predictors. Those that were obtained (generally in the half to one percent range) were widely scattered.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for the Analysis
of Home and School Standards of Deportment*

	Total Sample	Whites	Blacks	Parent's Education <HS	HS	>HS
Input Controls						
Race	.547	----	----	.479	.562	.617
	(.498)			(.500)	(.497)	(.487)
Parent's	11.844	11.628	12.025	9.554	----	15.204
Education	(2.545)	(2.839)	(2.257)	(1.440)		(1.997)
Sex	.502	.511	.494	.489	.484	.531
	(.500)	(.501)	(.501)	(.501)	(.501)	(.500)
Fall	278.142	279.194	277.296	268.469	278.247	294.567
Verb. CAT	(31.024)	(35.379)	(27.037)	(26.493)	(28.776)	(33.806)
Fall	269.780	272.819	267.346	262.168	269.924	281.409
Quant. CAT	(25.513)	(28.197)	(22.884)	(22.333)	(23.339)	(29.082)
Outcomes						
Fall	1.875	2.006	1.765	1.711	1.834	2.225
Reading Mark	(.704)	(.674)	(.712)	(.664)	(.596)	(.808)
Fall	2.241	2.421	2.089	2.005	2.249	2.575
Math Mark	(.836)	(.824)	(.817)	(.811)	(.783)	(.842)
Fall	1.745	1.823	1.680	1.735	1.749	1.767
Conduct Mark	(.435)	(.381)	(.466)	(.442)	(.433)	(.422)
Spring	2.267	2.449	2.113	2.023	2.277	2.650
Reading Mark	(.908)	(.939)	(.852)	(.828)	(.882)	(.956)
Spring	2.539	2.735	2.374	2.279	2.572	2.888
Math Mark	(.928)	(.934)	(.891)	(.905)	(.926)	(.866)
Spring	1.785	1.853	1.727	1.754	1.803	1.813
Conduct Mark	(.411)	(.354)	(.445)	(.432)	(.397)	(.390)
Spring	332.340	336.909	328.697	321.245	335.940	344.486
Verb. CAT	(35.946)	(37.330)	(34.413)	(33.230)	(36.495)	(34.504)
Spring	313.327	319.481	308.424	304.499	316.570	322.249
Quant. CAT	(30.548)	(29.955)	(30.160)	(30.394)	(29.691)	(28.620)

*Standard deviations are reported in parentheses.

Table 2
Conduct Category Averages for Parents and Teachers*

	Total Sample	Whites	Blacks	Parent's Education <HS	HS	>HS
Parents						
Follows Rules	2.521 (1.268)	2.706 (1.294)	2.359 (1.223)	2.440 (1.153)	2.585 (1.371)	2.547 (1.283)
Respects Others	.325 (.670)	.377 (.711)	.279 (.630)	.225 (.543)	.287 (.623)	.532 (.846)
Respects Self	.230 (.515)	.203 (.492)	.254 (.534)	.155 (.400)	.229 (.507)	.342 (.646)
Good Citizen	.071 (.313)	.086 (.327)	.057 (.299)	.035 (.203)	.087 (.341)	.100 (.392)
Shows Initiative	.088 (.369)	.086 (.345)	.090 (.390)	.077 (.377)	.047 (.245)	.163 (.482)
Does Assignments	.511 (.781)	.469 (.748)	.549 (.751)	.412 (.710)	.516 (.751)	.647 (.895)
Proper Values	.342 (.726)	.363 (.696)	.324 (.751)	.299 (.633)	.302 (.704)	.468 (.865)
Teachers						
Follows Rules	3.010 (1.739)	3.192 (1.436)	2.854 (1.950)	3.014 (1.745)	3.172 (1.699)	2.805 (1.795)
Respects Others	2.388 (2.117)	2.336 (2.080)	2.432 (2.150)	2.403 (2.015)	2.156 (1.912)	2.679 (2.598)
Respects Self	.766 (1.318)	1.183 (1.592)	.409 (.866)	.482 (.987)	.809 (1.426)	1.220 (1.521)
Good Citizen	.223 (.613)	.215 (.589)	.230 (.633)	.179 (.526)	.153 (.525)	.415 (.814)
Shows Initiative	.558 (.860)	.401 (.548)	.692 (1.039)	.514 (.785)	.653 (.933)	.434 (.792)
Does Assignments	1.644 (1.336)	1.605 (1.127)	1.677 (1.493)	1.654 (1.401)	1.729 (1.367)	1.572 (1.214)
Proper Values	1.374 (1.454)	1.357 (1.298)	1.389 (1.577)	1.368 (1.492)	1.389 (1.420)	1.465 (1.521)
% Congruence	31.710 (17.083)	33.662 (16.514)	29.980 (17.413)	31.896 (16.862)	32.049 (16.398)	31.167 (18.447)

* Standard deviations are reported in parentheses.

Table 3
Explained Variance Associated with Home and School Standards of Conduct and Home-School Concordance[a]

D.V./Model	Total Sample	Whites	Blacks	Parent's Education <HS	HS	>HS
Fall Reading Marks						
I. Input Controls	.290 (.285)	.290 (.283)	.270 (.263)	.167 (.156)	.156 (.145)	.414 (.401)
II. Parents + I	.293 (.280)	.298 (.273)	.274 (.251)	.191 (.154)	.177 (.141)	.424 (.378)
III. Teachers + II	.316 (.295)	.355 (.315)	.329 (.291)	.243 (.182)	.208 (.148)	.478 (.404)
IV. Concordance + III	.320 (.298)	.365 (.323)	.332 (.292)	.254 (.190)	.211 (.148)	.478 (.399)
Fall Math Marks						
I. Input Controls	.281 (.276)	.251 (.243)	.262 (.255)	.232 (.222)	.196 (.186)	.315 (.300)
II. Parents + I	.283 (.270)	.263 (.236)	.269 (.245)	.240 (.205)	.209 (.175)	.324 (.270)
III. Teachers + II	.331 (.310)	.378 (.339)	.322 (.284)	.309 (.253)	.270 (.215)	.501 (.430)
IV. Concordance + III	.331 (.309)	.379 (.338)	.324 (.283)	.318 (.260)	.270 (.212)	.502 (.426)

Table 3 continued

D.V./Model	Total Sample	Whites	Blacks	Parent's Education <HS	HS	>HS
Spring Conduct Marks						
I. Input Controls	.090 (.083)	.086 (.073)	.067 (.055)	.101 (.085)	.136 (.121)	.057 (.029)
II. Parents + I	.102 (.084)	.100 (.065)	.093 (.060)	.117 (.072)	.182 (.143)	.089 (.009)
III. Teachers + II	.118 (.089)	.179 (.124)	.108 (.055)	.148 (.074)	.234 (.172)	.166 (.039)
IV. Concordance + III	.120 (.090)	.181 (.124)	.115 (.058)	.148 (.070)	.235 (.170)	.184 (.052)
Spring Verbal CAT Scores						
I. Input Controls	.365 (.361)	.394 (.388)	.324 (.318)	.253 (.244)	.311 (.303)	.464 (.452)
II. Parents + I	.373 (.362)	.409 (.388)	.335 (.315)	.273 (.241)	.326 (.297)	.487 (.449)
III. Teachers + II	.379 (.361)	.460 (.427)	.357 (.324)	.310 (.258)	.337 (.289)	.535 (.473)
IV. Concordance + III	.380 (.361)	.460 (.425)	.360 (.325)	.310 (.254)	.338 (.286)	.550 (.487)
Spring Quantitative CAT Scores						
I. Input Controls	.436 (.432)	.439 (.434)	.415 (.410)	.415 (.407)	.372 (.364)	.500 (.490)
II. Parents + I	.441 (.432)	.443 (.424)	.435 (.418)	.429 (.405)	.380 (.354)	.526 (.490)
III. Teachers + II	.454 (.438)	.482 (.451)	.460 (.432)	.443 (.401)	.394 (.350)	.593 (.539)
IV. Concordance + III	.454 (.438)	.485 (.452)	.461 (.431)	.444 (.399)	.395 (.347)	.594 (.537)

a) explained variance estimates in parentheses are adjusted for degrees of freedom.

Table 3 continued

D.V./Model	Total Sample	Whites	Blacks	Parent's Education <HS	HS	>HS
Fall Conduct Marks						
I. Input Controls	.101 (.094)	.058 (.045)	.104 (.092)	.121 (.105)	.113 (.098)	.077 (.049)
II. Parents + I	.119 (.101)	.076 (.039)	.143 (.112)	.134 (.089)	.154 (.114)	.119 (.042)
III. Teachers + II	.155 (.128)	.184 (.129)	.188 (.140)	.156 (.083)	.233 (.172)	.262 (.150)
IV. Concordance + III	.158 (.129)	.193 (.136)	.190 (.139)	.158 (.081)	.237 (.173)	.266 (.147)
Spring Reading Marks						
I. Input Controls	.349 (.345)	.376 (.370)	.278 (.271)	.248 (.238)	.219 (.209)	.501 (.490)
II. Parents + I	.355 (.343)	.394 (.372)	.294 (.271)	.251 (.223)	.234 (.201)	.514 (.476)
III. Teachers + II	.385 (.366)	.446 (.411)	.357 (.320)	.345 (.293)	.289 (.235)	.548 (.484)
IV. Concordance + III	.386 (.367)	.453 (.417)	.357 (.318)	.355 (.300)	.290 (.233)	.553 (.485)
Spring Math Marks						
I. Input Controls	.327 (.322)	.331 (.324)	.272 (.265)	.241 (.230)	.311 (.302)	.374 (.360)
II. Parents + I	.333 (.320)	.344 (.321)	.289 (.265)	.254 (.220)	.330 (.301)	.397 (.350)
III. Teachers + II	.343 (.323)	.438 (.403)	.325 (.287)	.289 (.232)	.373 (.324)	.464 (.388)
IV. Concordance + III	.344 (.323)	.444 (.407)	.325 (.285)	.289 (.228)	.373 (.322)	.473 (.393)

Table 4
Teachers' Criteria of Good and Poor Conduct
Predictive of First Grade Outcomes

	Total Sample	Whites	Blacks	Parent's Education <HS	HS	>HS
Fall Marks:						
Reading	(+) Initiative (+) Citizen (+) Respects Self	(+) Values	(-) Values (+) Citizen (+) Assignments	(+) Initiative	(+) Respects Others	(+) Respects Self
Math	(+) Respects Self (+) Initiative	(+) Respects Self (+) Rules	(-) Rules	(+) Citizen (+) Initiative	(+) Respects Self	(+) Respects Self
Conduct	(+) Citizen (+) Rules (-) Respects Self (+) Values	(+) Respects Others (-) Respects Self (-) Initiative (+) Rules	(-) Values (+) Citizen (+) Rules	-- ------	(+) Citizen (+) Rules (-) Respects Self	(-) Assignments
Spring Marks:						
Reading	(+) Respects Others (+) Values (+) Assignments	(+) Values (+) Rules	(+) Assignments (+) Citizen	(+) Respects Others (+) Values	(+) Respects Others (+) Respects Self	-- ------
Math	-- ------	(+) Rules (+) Citizen (-) Assignments (+) Respects Others	(-) Rules (+) Values	(+) Rules	(-) Assignments (+) Respects Others	(-) Respects Others (+) Initiative
Conduct	-- ------	(+) Rules (-) Initiative (+) Respects Others	(+) Citizen	(+) Assignments	(-) Initiative (-) Values	(+) Citizen
Spring CAT Scores						
Verbal	-- ------	(-) Initiative (+) Respects Self (+) Values (-) Citizen	(-) Respects Self	-- ------	-- ------	(-) Respects Others
Quantitative	(-) Citizen	(-) Citizen (-) Initiative	(-) Values	-- ------	-- ------	(-) Citizen

References

Alexander, Karl L. and Martha A. Cook. 1982. "Curricula and Coursework: Surprise Ending to a Familiar Story." American Sociological Review 47: 626-640.

Alexander, Karl L. and Bruce K. Eckland. 1980. "The 'Explorations in Equality of Opportunity' Sample of 1955 High School Sophomores." Pp. 31-58 in Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, V. 1, edited by Alan C. Kerckhoff. JAI Press.

Alexander, Karl L., Doris R. Entwisle, Doris Cadigan and Aaron M. Pallas. 1985. "Getting Started in School: Teachers and First Grade Achievement." Unpublished manuscript.

Averch, Harvey A., Stephen J. Carroll, Theodore S. Donaldson, Herbert J. Kiesling and John Pincus. 1972. How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings. Rand Corporation.

Bernstein, Basil. 1964. "Elaborated and Restricted Codes: Their Social Origins and Some Consequences." Pp. 55-69 in The Ethnography of Communication, edited by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes. American Anthropologist Special Publication 66:No. 6, Part 2.

Bossert, Stephen T. 1979. Tasks and Social Relationships in Classrooms. Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. Reproduction in Education, Society, Culture. Sage.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 1976. Schooling in Capitalist America. Basic Books.

Bowles, Samuel, Herbert Gintis and Peter Meyer. 1975. "The Long Shadow of Work: Education, the Family and the Reproduction of the Social Division of Labor." Insurgent Sociologist 3:3-22.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. 1958. "Socialization and Social Class through Time and Space." Pp. 400-425 in Readings in Social Psychology, edited by Eleanor E. Maccoby. Holt.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie and A.C. Crouter. 1982. "Work and Family through Time and Space." In Families that Work: Children in a Changing World, edited by Sheila B. Kamerman and Cheryl D. Hayes. National Academy Press.

Brophy, Jere E. and Thomas L. Good. 1974. Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. Holt.

Coleman, James S., Thomas Hoffer and Sally Kilgore. 1982. High School Achievement: Public, Catholic and Private Schools Compared. Basic Books.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1982. "Cultural Capital and School Success: The Impact of Status Culture Participation on the Grades of U.S. High School Students." American Sociological Review 47:189-201.

Dusek, Jerome B. 1975. "Do Teachers Bias Children's Learning?" Review of Educational Research 45:661-684.

Elashoff, Janet D. and Richard E. Snow. 1971. Pygmalion Reconsidered. Jones Publishing Co.

Entwisle, Doris R., Karl L. Alexander, Aaron M. Pallas and Doris Cadigan. 1986a. "Educational Attainment over First Grade." Unpublished manuscript.

_____. 1986b "The Emergent Academic Self-image of First Graders: Its Response to Social Structure." Unpublished manuscript.

Entwisle, Doris R. and Leslie A. Hayduk. 1982. Early Schooling: Cognitive and Affective Outcomes. Johns Hopkins Press.

Epstein, Joyce L. 1983. "Longitudinal Effects of Person-Family-School Interactions on Student Outcomes." Pp. 101-127 in Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization: Vol. 4, edited by Alan Kerckhoff. JAI Press.

Epstein, Joyce L. 1984. "A Longitudinal Study of School and Family Effects on Student Development." In Longitudinal Research in the U.S., edited by Sarnoff A. Mednick, Michele Harway and Karen M. Finello. Praeger.

Epstein, Joyce L. and James M. McPartland. 1977. "Family and School Interactions and Main Effects on Affective Outcomes." Report No. 235. Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Fischer, Kurt W. and Daniel Bullock. 1984. "Cognitive Development in School-Age Children: Conclusions and New Directions." Pp. 70-146 in Development During Middle Childhood: The Years from Six to Twelve, edited by W. Andrew Collins. National Academy Press.

Gasson, Ruth M., Archibald O. Haller and William H. Sewell. 1972. "Attitudes and Facilitation in the Attainment Process". The Arnold and Caroline Rose Monograph Series.

Hess, Robert D. and Susan D. Holloway. 1984. "Family and School as Educational Institutions." Pp. 179-222 in Review of Child Development Research, Vol. 7, edited by Ross D. Parke. Chicago.

Hess, Robert D. and Virginia C. Shipman. 1965. "Early Experience and Socialization of Cognitive Modes in Children." Child Development 36:869-886.

Holland, John L. 1973. Making Vocational Choices: A Theory of Careers. Prentice-Hall.

Howell, Frank M. and Lynn W. McBroom. 1982. "Social Relations at Home and at School: An Analysis of the Correspondence Principle." Sociology of Education 55:40-52.

Karabel, Jerome and A.H. Halsey. 1977. "Educational Research: A Review and an Interpretation." Pp. 1-85 in Power and Ideology in Education, edited by Jerome Karabel and A.H. Halsey. Oxford University Press.

Kedar-Voivodas, Gita. 1983. "The Impact of Elementary Children's Roles and Sex Roles on Teacher Attitudes: An Interactional Analysis." Review of Educational Research 53:414-437.

Kerckhoff, Alan C. and Richard T. Campbell. 1977. "Black-White Differences in the Educational Attainment Process." Sociology of Education 50:15-27.

Kohn, Melvin L. 1977. Class and Conformity: A Study in Values. Chicago.

Lambert, Wallace E., Marcel A. Just and N. Segalowitz. 1970. Pp. 229-279 in 21st Annual Roundtable, edited by James E. Alatis. Georgetown University.

Lambert, Wallace E. and John Macnamara. 1969. "Some Cognitive Consequences of Following a First-Grade Curriculum in a Second Language." Journal of Educational Psychology 60:86-96.

Lerner, Richard M. 1985. "Individual and Context in Developmental Psychology: Conceptual and Theoretical Issues." Pp. 155-187 in Individual Development and Social Change, edited by John R. Nesselrode and Alexander Von Eye. Academic.

Lerner, Richard M. and Nancy A. Busch-Rossnagel. 1981. "Individuals as Producers of their Development: Conceptual and Empirical Bases." Pp. 1-36 in Individuals as Producers of Their Development: A Life-Span Perspective, edited by Richard M. Lerner and Nancy A. Busch-Rossnagel. Academic.

Miller, Karen A., Melvin L. Kohn and Carmi Schooler. 1985. "Educational Self-direction and the Cognitive Functioning of Students." Social Forces 63:923-944.

Murnane, Richard J. 1975. The Impact of School Resources on the Learning of Inner City Children. Ballinger.

Olneck, Michael R. and David B. Bills. 1980. "What Makes Sammy Run? An Empirical Assessment of the Bowles-Gintis Correspondence Principle." American Journal of Education 89:27-61.

Parsons, Talcott. 1959. "The School Class as a Social System: Some of its Functions in American Society." Harvard Educational Review 29:297-318.

Patterson, Gerald R. 1982. Coercive Family Process: A Social Learning Approach, Vol. 3. Castalia Publishing Co.

Rist, Ray C. 1970. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." Harvard Educational Review 40:411-451.

Rist, Ray C. 1973. The Urban School: A Factory for Failure. MIT Press.

Rosenthal, Robert and Lenore Jacobson. 1968. Pygmalion in the Classroom. Holt

Sewell, William H. and Robert M. Hauser. 1980. "The Wisconsin Longitudinal Study of Social and Psychological Factors in Aspirations and Achievements." Pp. 59-100 in Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, V. 1, edited by Alan C. Kerckhoff. JAI Press.

Shea, Brent M. 1976. "Schooling and its Antecedents: Substantive and Methodological Issues in the Status Attainment Process." Review of Educational Research 46:463-526.

Stritchfield, Shirley A. and J. Steven Picou. 1982. "The Structure of Significant Others Influence on Status Aspirations: Black-white Differences." Sociology of Education 55:22-30.

Summers, Anita A. and Barbara L. Wolfe. 1977. "Do Schools Make a Difference?" American Economic Review 65:639-652.

Williams, Frederick. 1970. "Language Attitude and Social Change." In Language and Poverty, edited by Frederick Williams. Markham.

Williams, Trevor. 1976. "Teacher Prophecies and the Inheritance of Inequality." Sociology of Education 49:223-236.

Wrong, Dennis. 1961. "The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology." American Sociological Review 26:184-193.